Response to Comment P1-5

In the absence of the Proposed Project, the shoreline of the Salton Sea is projected to decline. Water conservation and transfer under the Proposed Project would accelerate the rate of decline and result in a lower shoreline at equilibrium. As explained under Impact BR - 49, shoreline habitat would continue to be available for birds at lower surface elevations, and analysis of available bathymetric data suggests that the amount of shallow water habitat could increase. As a result, adverse impacts to birds from a decline in the water surface elevation are not expected.

The Salton Sea model developed by Reclamation was used to project salinity in the Salton Sea under the Project Alternatives and Baseline condition. This model took into consideration factors influencing evaporative losses (including weather conditions and the size of the Salton Sea) in predicting salinity.

The Salton Sea Habitat Conservation Strategy in the HCP would avoid significant impacts to biological resources from the Proposed Project by offsetting project-related reductions in inflow to the Salton Sea. This strategy would avoid the acceleration in salinization attributable to the Proposed Project and resultant responses of biological resources until the point at which fish would no longer be supported under the baseline. See Master Response for Biology—Approach to the Salton Sea Conservation Strategy in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-6

Please refer to the Master Response on Air Quality—Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan in Section 3 of this Final FIR/FIS.

It's been well-documented that the state of California has had a tremendous loss of its wetlands, and this is a critical element within that fly-way zone. We are not supportive of the water transfer if it, in fact, changes the shoreline for the lake -- or the Sea. That's consistent with a resolution that was adopted by CVAG, the Coachella Valley Association of Governments, as well as ourselves. We believe that any transfer needs to mitigate 11 and/or address maintaining its shoreline.

at an international magnitude because of the use of the

area by the wildlife and birds, particularly in their

migratory patterns.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

We believe that not only will this upset the important areas for the bird life, but that there is an unquantifiable impact potentially on the fisheries as a result of having a decrease in water levels, and by a potential increase in the temperature of the water. Therefore, putting it potentially into a situation where you have even accelerated evaporation.

There are a lot of arguments on that issue on both sides, but we don't think that that has been resolved to a point to where it would be intelligent for us as, if you will, a species, for that matter, to take a gamble on what that modeling might look like at this early stage.

We also believe that as a result of exposing

P1-6

P1-5

Response to Comment P1-7

In accordance with CEQA and NEPA guidelines, the Project has conducted several public involvement activities to solicit input from federal, state, and regional local agencies, as well as the general public, on the scope of the Project, potential impacts, and adequacy of the environmental document. See Section 1.8.2 in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-8

Comment noted. The environmental document was made available to the public for review at several libraries in the Proposed Project region of influence. The document was also made available electronically on the Project website at http://www.is.ch2m.com/iidweb and on CD-ROM.

shoreline, that we will also increase the amount of

particulates that will become airborne. We know that

there are multiple cases of asthma already in the Imperial

Valley, and we would be subjecting the human population to

5 a tremendous potential health hazard as well, in the event

6 that there are these transfers.

So we, again, believe that there should be a

process of intense -- basically, it takes more

stakeholders beyond the confines of both the Water

District and the agricultural community, but include, as

well, the business community, the general citizenship in

12 the area and, as well, some additional Mexican testimony

13 in relation to their views on the water transfer.

14 I want to thank you very much. We will be

15 providing you with some written comments that are more

16 in-depth. Thank you very much.

17 MS. CARD: Thank you, Mr. Nichols. Sergio Nunez?

18 MR. NUNEZ: Hello, my name is Sergio Nunez and I'm a

9 resident of the local Indio area. First of all, I'd like

20 to say that I did not receive the CD until Monday, so we

21 have not had an opportunity to go through this material.

22 Furthermore, I believe the reports should have been

23 submitted at our local libraries, such as Palm Springs.

24 The CD does not to interact with my computer and

25 the screen is not the same to interact with material as to

P1-8

P1-6

P1-7

Response to Comment P1-9
Without a specific reference to a part of the Draft EIR/EIS, this comment is too general to respond to. Comment noted.

P1-8

P1-9

2	quicker.
3	Furthermore, I believe that the community does
4	not support the water transfer because the water
5	transfer we need that water here for future growth and
6	for development of our future, same as Imperial. How can
7	a competing region, a coastal region, take away our most
8	important resource, being water, from our region? How can
9	we surrender that?
10	So to start off with (reading), "The United
11	Nations Security Council's adopted declarations from the
12	Millenium Summit can offer us some guidance. The UN
13	reaffirmed us to give equal priority to the maintenance of
14	international peace and security in every region of the
15	world, and to pay special attention to the promotion of
16	durable peace and sustainable development (post-conflict
17	peace-building.)
18	"The competition for limited resources, water,
19	and rapid population growth are the root cause of regional
20	conflict which threaten global peace and sustainable
21	development. The Security Council strongly encourages for
22	the development of comprehensive and integrated strategies
23	to address the root causes of conflict, including their
24	economic and social dimensions."
25	What I'm talking about here is the Colorado

the text, as to try to understand it and go through it

Response to Comment P1-10

Comment noted.

P1-9

P1-10

```
self-interest for the benefit of all of us, the public?
 6
                 So I think now with the -- September 11th, I
      was in Mexicali at the Colorado Delta Symposium, and I've
      been talking these words way before September 11th, and it
      really hurt. I don't know. How can people start
      listening?
11
               I ran for office here. 7280 voters here in the
      Valley feel the same way that I feel, and that's why they
     put their votes to me. I ran for the local water
      district. I ran for the local college district also in
15
      2001. There is a concern here in the valley about this
      water transfer. And I'll put that -- that's the end of
16
17
      that. Thank you very much.
18
          MS. CARD: Thank you, Mr. Nunez. Chuck Friedly.
19
          MR. FRIEDLY: Chuck Friedly from Desert Shores. I'm
20
     a property owner. I would almost like to reserve time a
21
     little later after I hear more comments, because I really
22
     wasn't ready for this meeting today. I just heard about
23
     it when I was in town today.
24
               I'm a property owner. I built my own house at
```

Desert Shores. I have sunk my life savings into this

Delta, the Salton Sea. We need this water to develop a comprehensive strategy to address both issues. I believe they can be done with one simple solution, but do our leaders have that vision? Can they put aside their

Response to Comment P1-11

Please refer to the Master Response on *Air Quality—Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-12

Comment noted.

Response to Comment P1-13

The second implementation scenario for the Proposed Project (QSA Implementation) includes the more restrictive limit on IID's future diversions of Colorado River water on IID's Priority 3 diversions. Under the maximum transfers provided for under the QSA, IID would retain the ability to divert in excess of 2.6 MAFY of Colorado River water for agricultural, industrial, and domestic use within the IID water service area. In addition, at the end of the initial 45-year term, the IID/SDCWA Transfer Agreement potentially allows IID to reclaim up to 34 KAFY of transfer water for M&I use within the Imperial Valley. This amount is twice the expected growth in M&I use within the IID water service area over the next 45 years. Therefore, the Proposed Project and Alternatives described in the Draft EIR/EIS can be implemented without compromising the Imperial Valley's urban water supply. IID will continue to make water deliveries reasonably required for municipal and industrial beneficial uses, including current use and expected growth in these sectors.

Response to Comment P1-14

Please refer to the Master Response on *Air Quality—Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

		1	property. It is a 200-foot waterfront property that I
		2	live on, and that the wife and I have built from scratch.
	1	3	We don't want this water transfer to go through
		4	because if they do, we're going to have a dust bowl just
P1-11		5	like the (inaudible) area. We don't need that chemical
	d.	6	reaction running around in the air.
	30	7	We have the birds, which is the wildlife, and we
		8	love the birds. Our favorite ones there are the white and
P1-12		9	brown pelicans. The brown one is an endangered species.
		10	I wake up every morning and I see birds and pelicans in my
	948	11	backyard, right out my kitchen window.
	ľ	12	Also, it would hurt economically the area if we
		13	lose our water, because now I've just heard that the
		14	dairymen are thinking about going to the Imperial Valley.
		15	They're going to need water. I was affiliated with the
		16	dairies before in Artesia. They got pushed out. Now
		17	they're being pushed out of Chino, and they'll have to go
P1-13		18	to the San Joaquin Valley. This is where they grow the
		19	product the alfalfa and the hay, and they need that
		20	resource down here. We don't need the water to leave our
		21	area.
		22	If they have to do it, we want something in
	L	23	return from San Diego, like either reclaimed water to save
UNION NOTA	T	24	the Sea. We've got to have it or it will dry up and we'll
P1-14	- 1	25	have a dust how! We don't need that Thank you

have a dust bowl. We don't need that. Thank you.

property. It is a 200-foot waterfront property that I

2 speaker cards? 3 Well, we do have an announcement. It has come to our attention that the diskettes that we have here tonight may be defective. If you find out yours is defective, please call Sandy Eto, E-T-O, at 602-216-3857, and the Bureau of Reclamation will provide another copy to you. Please make sure your address is provided if you leave her a message. 10 We have no speaker cards at this time. What 11 we'd like to do, then, is go off the record and provide 12 folks an opportunity to mill around with the staff of the 13 Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Imperial Irrigation District. Then after a 15-, 14 15 20-minute break, we'll go back on the record if folks have 16 additional comments for the record. 17 (Off the record.) 18 MS. CARD: We'd like to go back on the record now. 19 It's 5:50 p.m. 20 We have another speaker. Shirley Lee Palmer, 21 representing DISA. Mrs. Palmer, if you could tell us who 22 you're representing.

MS. PALMER: Good evening to the panel. Good

evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Shirley Lee
Palmer. I live in Desert Shores, California, and I'm

MS. CARD: Thank you, Mr. Friedly. Are there anymore

1

23

Response to Comment P1-15

Please refer to the Master Response on *Air Quality—Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-16

Refer to the Master Response on *Socioeconomics—Property Values* and *Fiscal Impact Estimates* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

representing the Desert Shores Improvement Association,

2 of which I'm the president.

I have lived around the Salton Sea for 40

years. I have watched it when it flooded and IID was

sued, to their demise. I have been all around the world.

I've lived in many places, but I'm here because of the

7 Salton Sea. I have businesses around the Sea.

8 This last three weeks I have done research in

the county libraries regarding the winds of the Salton

10 Sea. I understand that the science people can't take this

as fact. They have to have the actual recordings from

12 their instruments from the different agencies that keep

13 the wind miles per hour, but in my reading of the articles

14 in the paper, there were winds up to 165 miles an hour.

15 Of all the storms that I read about, the winds were at

16 least 85 miles an hour.

17 We have Borregos all the time. I don't know if

18 you're from this area or not, but if you are, sometimes

19 the winds blow for days and days and days. If the seabed

20 is exposed, life will be unbearable when the winds blow.

21 I live in Imperial County, Desert Shores, and it

22 is beautiful. The Salton Sea brings many visitors to my

23 town, to my businesses, and if the Sea goes, my business

24 will go. My life will go. I don't want to move. I love

25 the Salton Sea.

P1-15

P1-16

Response to Comment P1-17

Comment noted.

Response to Comment P1-18

Comment noted. Potential impacts to sensitive receptors, including humans, as a result of Salton Sea shoreline receding are addressed in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-19

Comment noted.

Response to Comment P1-20

Comment noted.

```
I'm here to tell you that in the three weeks
                           that I've been going around the Sea and to the library,
                           Mrs. and Mrs. LaRue from Salton Sea Beach, Jim Johnson and
P1-17
                           I have talked to over 1000 people. They do not want a
                           transfer of water.
                                     I understand that maybe a transfer of some sort
                           has to be made. Everybody feels that a three-feet
                           lowering of the sea would not be bad, but anything else
                           would not be acceptable to us. I know that you have to --
P1-18
                           that the birds are the main issue to everyone, to all the
                           environmentalists, but you've got to consider people and
                     12
                           their quality of life, and even their being able to live.
                    13
                                     The people in my town are senior citizens.
                           They're too old. They don't want to move. They moved
P1-19
                     15
                           there because they worked hard all their life and they've
                           come there to enjoy the Salton Sea. It is beautiful. I
                    16
                    17
                           cannot tell you of the tranquility, the marvelous sunsets
                           and sunrises. The summertime heat is horrible, but if you
                           live in a house with air-conditioning, it's not so bad.
                    20
                                     Please really, really take into issue the
                    21
                          people. We don't want to lose the Sea, and we ask you to
                    22
                          not take our water. Thank you.
                    23
                                MS. CARD: Thank you, Ms. Palmer.
                    24
                                     Any other speaker cards? Anyone who would like
                           to step forward and speak, including those who have
```

Response to Comment P1-21

Please refer to the Master Response on *Air Quality—Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment P1-22

Comment noted.

already made a statement? We'll open back up for an

2 additional five minutes.

MR. NICHOLS: Hello, again. For the record, I'm Mark

Nichols with the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians. It's

great to be able to have a few more minutes.

It's interesting when people talk about "three

feet." I just heard the words "three feet wouldn't be too

8 bad" and somebody saying "I know that some of this has to

9 happen." I mean, there's sort of a presumption that this

10 has to happen out there in people's minds. Unfortunately,

though, I think the majority of people that aren't quote

and you of the William Schools Inc.

12 "in the business" in some fashion or form are not

13 supportive of this transfer.

14 It's my understanding that a reduction of three

15 feet, or at least five feet, would basically reveal about

74,000 acres of shoreline that's currently covered. So

17 I'm not sure that people understand that a mere three feet

18 might expose 35,000 acres of shoreline. So that's very

19 significant.

16

20 Once that dust blows over the residents that

21 live locally, it's going to predominantly blow over the

22 agricultural workers and people that are probably the

23 least protected and have the least amount of opportunity

24 to represent their own interests.

25 To the south of us, and occasionally we in the

P1-22

P1-21

Response to Comment P1-23

Comment noted.

Response to Comment P1-24

Comment noted.

Response to Comment P1-25

The EIR/EIS presents the type and magnitude of estimated third-party socioeconomic impacts associated with the Proposed Project and each alternative evaluated in the EIR/EIS. As described in the Draft EIR/EIS, depending on the eventual implementation of the water conservation program, there could either be beneficial or adverse impacts to the regional economy. If water is conserved using on-farm and water delivery system improvements, it is anticipated that there would be beneficial effects to regional employment; therefore, there would not be any adverse effects to mitigate. If fallowing is used to conserve all or a portion of the water to be transferred, there would be adverse effects to the regional economy and farm workers as identified in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The IID Board will consider whether to implement socioeconomic mitigation measures when it considers whether to approve the Proposed Project or an alternative to the Proposed Project.

Palm Springs area and in the Palm Desert area will also

feel the effects, and those will be devastating to us from

an economic standpoint.

I wanted to sort of close the floor with our

comments to suggest that, you know, we've talked about

this in terms of it being a -- I guess, a scientific

problem, a development problem, a transfer problem. We

think this needs to be in the form of and only framed from

the perspective of initially a moral decision.

10 As we look back on what we've done through our
11 lives and in maybe our children's lives and so forth,
12 we're going to sort of ultimately be judged not only by
13 what we did in terms of sticks and bricks, but what were
14 the ethics.

If, in fact, the water belongs to the property, we believe that it was for purposes of farming, and that to the extent that the water transfer has to transfer out -- and we say that these opportunities or options for retransferring water back into the area, one being pipe in or pipe out, or even the grander scheme of a canal or, say, paying some farmers for not farming so that we could have access to that, or paying Coachella Valley for its allocation, whatever it is, these are all too expensive.

I have yet to see calculations of what these
transfers are going to generate. I think there should be

P1-25

19

P1-22

P1-23

P1-24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21